

U.S.S.N. 10/065,246

7

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

81045777

JUL 25 2006

## REMARKS

In the Office Action of May 3, 2006, claims 1-22 and 24 are pending. Claims 14-22 are allowed. Claims 1 and 8 are independent claims from which claims 2-7, 9-13, and 24 depend. Claims 1, 8, and 24 are herein amended.

The Office Action states that claims 1, 5, 8-10, and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamamoto (U.S. Pat. No. 5,774,819).

Amended claim 1 recites the limitations of a steering wheel input calculation block that calculates a steering wheel input in response to a corrected steering wheel input and a modified steering wheel input. The corrected steering wheel input and the modified steering wheel input are in a parallel input relationship with each other.

The Office Action states that Yamamoto discloses a corrected steering wheel input and a modified steering wheel input and refers to the yaw deviation  $\gamma-\gamma_0$  and output T2, which are the input and output of the second function block f2 of the system of Yamamoto. Regardless of whether this is true, it is clear that the input and the output of the function block f2 are clearly not in parallel, but rather are in series. Thus, Yamamoto fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of claim 1.

Amended claim 8 recites the limitation of controlling a steering actuator in response to the sum of a corrected steering wheel input and a modified steering wheel input. The output T2 of Yamamoto is generated as a function of the yaw deviation  $\gamma-\gamma_0$ . The output T2 is not summed with the yaw deviation  $\gamma-\gamma_0$ . Thus, Yamamoto also fails to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 8.

In order for a reference to anticipate a claim the reference must teach or suggest each and every element of that claim, see MPEP 2131 and *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628. Thus, since Yamamoto fails to teach or suggest each and every element of claims 1 and 8, they are novel, nonobvious, and are in a condition for allowance. Since claims 5, 9-10, and 24 depend from claims 1 and 8, respectively, they are also novel, nonobvious, and are in a condition for allowance for at least the same reasons.

Claims 2-4 and 12-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamamoto in view of Klosterhaus (U.S. Pat. No. 5,002,142).

U.S.S.N. 10/849,590

10


81044234

claims 36-42, which depend from claim 35, are also novel, nonobvious, and are in a condition for allowance.

In light of the amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all the rejections are now overcome. The Applicants have added no new matter to the application by these amendments. The application is now in condition for allowance and expeditious notice thereof is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

**ARTZ & ARTZ, P.C.**



---

Jeffrey J. Chapp, Reg. No. 50,579  
28333 Telegraph Road, Suite 250  
Southfield, MI 48034  
(248) 223-9500

Dated: July 25, 2006